REMARKS

Summary

This paper replaces, in its entirety, the paper submitted on February 4, 2004, which contained typographic errors. The Applicants regret any inconvenience that this has caused.

Claims 1-19 pending and all of the claims were rejected in the Office action; Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, and 15-19 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-19 are pending after entry of this amendment. The Applicants have carefully considered the reasons advanced by the Examiner and respectfully traverse the rejections in view of the amendments and the discussion presented below.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §102 (b)

Claims 1-19 were rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by Levin et al. (US 6,154,201: "Levin").

Amended Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an actuator which positions at least one of a ball and a pin with respect to the feeling providing device.

This has an advantage of providing more than one feel of operation of the knob based on the function being performed.

Levin teaches an actuator, controlled electronically to output forces to the shaft, such as bumps and jerks or vibrations (column 7, line 61; column 8, line 10; column 10, line 15). The various output forces are implemented by a microprocessor or controller (column 14, lines 28-33) and are based on force profiles stored in a computer readable medium. This is quite different from

mechanically positioning a ball or pin in elastic opposition to a feeling providing device.

Levin does not teach or suggest the arrangement of amended Claim 1, and it is therefore not anticipated.

Claims 2 and 19 are dependent on Claim 1 and are allowable, without more, as claims dependent on an allowable base claim. Claims 2-19 are also independently patentable. For example, with respect to Claim 5, the Examiner identifies element 52 as a disc and element 54 as plural feeling patterns. In contrast, Levin identifies 52 as a switch and 54 as output leads (column 8, lines 32-40, Id.). The output leads are 54 are fixed to the portion of the switch attached to the front panel 12, rather than the shaft 50 as suggested by the Examiner, and 50 is a shaft rather than a pin. In order for the shaft 50 to contact the portion of the switch 54 that is attached to the from panel 12, the operator must provide the force. Operator action is not an integral part of the structure, so the shaft cannot contact the switch in Levin except in response to a force exerted by the operator. As such, the Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of anticipation, which would require that all of the elements and the arrangement thereof be shown in Levin. The same arguments can be made for the independent patentability of Claims 6 and 7.

Conclusion

Claims 1- 19 were pending; Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 13, and 15-19 have been amended. Claims 1-19 are now pending.

For at least the reasons given above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200